

Low Resolution Coring Supplemental Sampling Program Characterization
For the Lower Passaic River Study Area Revised Report, Dated November 24, 2014
Review Of Response To EPA's 6/17/2014 Comments And Additional Comments
Lower Passaic River Study Area RI/FS
Response to 2/4/15 USEPA Comments

No.	General Comment	CPG Response	CDM Smith Review	Response
1	Please revise the title to indicate that this report contains a summary of only the 2012 LRC SSP results.	The report includes data from the Low Resolution Coring (LRC) program and the benthic programs in figures and tables. A sentence has been added to the introduction to describe the data that are included in the report.	Please remove the word "complete" from the sentence added to the introduction (Page 1-2), and replace "to date" with "prior to this sampling event." Given the timing of this report and the SSP2 report, the current wording is confusing	The requested change was made to the report.

No.	Page No.	Specific Comments	CPG Response	CDM Smith Review	Response
2	Page 2-3, Third paragraph, first sentence	Please note the typographical error and change "were" to "where".	The requested edit was made to the report.	The typographical error is still in the text. Based on the RL-SO version, it appears that the edit was made and then changed back.	The requested change was made to the report. A couple of other typographical errors were noted in the table and corrected.

Low Resolution Coring Supplemental Sampling Program Characterization
For the Lower Passaic River Study Area Revised Report, Dated November 24, 2014
Review Of Response To EPA's 6/17/2014 Comments And Additional Comments
Lower Passaic River Study Area RI/FS
Response to 2/4/15 USEPA Comments

No.	Page No.	Specific Comments	CPG Response	CDM Smith Review	Response
5	Page 2-9, Section 2.5.1, Last paragraph, last sentence & Table 2-6	The text indicates that only the highest headspace readings for each station are shown on Table 2-6. Suggest inserting a title or footnote over the headspace reading columns in Table 2-6 indicating they are the highest readings recorded at each location. In addition, some text is cut off within the cells on Table 2-6, the row height may need to be resized.	The notes to Table 2-6 already indicate that the highest reading at each location is presented. The note says, "Total VOCs, H ₂ S, and Hg values are maximum readings per station during vapor screening of sediment." To clarify this information the table notes have been changed to footnotes with appropriate references in the table column headings. In addition, the table was reformatted to ensure all of the text is clearly visible.	Some of the words in the 5th column of Table 2-6 are still cut off.	The requested change was made to the table.

Low Resolution Coring Supplemental Sampling Program Characterization
For the Lower Passaic River Study Area Revised Report, Dated November 24, 2014
Review Of Response To EPA's 6/17/2014 Comments And Additional Comments
Lower Passaic River Study Area RI/FS
Response to 2/4/15 USEPA Comments

No.	Page No.	Specific Comments	CPG Response	CDM Smith Review	Response
6	Page 3-1, Section 3.0, third paragraph, last sentence	Please revise as the RM 10.9 Removal Action is no longer planned.	The requested edit was made to the report.	The comment was addressed as requested. However, upon further consideration, EPA requests that the phrase "because a Removal Action has been completed for the RM 10.9 area" be replaced with "because this design-level data is of too high a density for the purposes of this report; sediment data collected from the removal area during the LRC SSP, LRC and benthic sampling events are included."	The requested change was made to the report in Section 3.0 and at two other locations (Executive Summary and Section 1) where the RM 10.9 Removal Action is referenced.

Low Resolution Coring Supplemental Sampling Program Characterization
For the Lower Passaic River Study Area Revised Report, Dated November 24, 2014
Review Of Response To EPA's 6/17/2014 Comments And Additional Comments
Lower Passaic River Study Area RI/FS
Response to 2/4/15 USEPA Comments

No.	Page No.	Specific Comments	CPG Response	CDM Smith Review	Response
19	Page 4-4, Section 4.2.6, last sentence	A summary of "specific matrix issues" should be included in this section. These can be somewhat general or the most common issues encountered that impacted the sensitivity of the analyses.	<p>The data validation reports included in Appendix H and the narratives included in the laboratory reports (included in the data submittals included with the monthly status reports) contain the most specific information about the issues that resulted in data qualification. A summary of the percentage of data qualified by reason and the impacted analyses is provided in Table 4-1; this includes a summary of the percentage of samples qualified for matrix and quantitation-related issues. The most common issue was the need for sample dilution to overcome matrix interferences which resulted in elevated reporting limits for certain target analytes. Additional text has been added to Section 4.2.6.</p>	<p>The CPG's response does not sufficiently address the comment. A reference to Table 4-1 should be added, the text added at the end, "as well as the laboratory report narratives", should indicate where these narratives can be found, and every row in Table 4-1 should have some explanation in the "Comments" column.</p>	<p>A reference to Table 4-1 has been added in Section 4.2.6. Additional text has been added to indicate that the laboratory reports were submitted to USEPA with monthly reports. Comments were added to Table 4-1 for LCS recovery, Ether interference, and Sample result uncertainty.</p>